



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

M

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,604	07/01/2002	Wilfried Lubisch	50761	6919
7590	04/08/2004		EXAMINER	
WOOD, PHILIPS, KATZ, CLARK AND MORTIMER			KIFLE, BRUCK	
CITICORP CENTER, SUITE 3800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
500 W. MADISON ST.				
CHICAGO,, IL 60661-2511			1624	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/088,604	LUBISCH ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.	1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 24,25 and 27-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 24, 25 and 27-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

Art Unit: 1624

Applicant's amendments and remarks filed 03/02/04 have been received and reviewed.

Claims 24, 25 and 27-54 are now pending in this application.

***Election/Restrictions***

This application contains claims drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 11. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01. Only subject matter wherein "A" is a C<sub>2</sub> group is under consideration.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 32-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding claim 32, Applicants have not given any direction as to which disorders are embraced and which ones are not. Is extensive experimentation required on the part of a potential infringer to determine if his use of Applicants' inhibitor falls within the limitations of applicants' claim? *In re Kirk and Petrow*, 153 USPQ 48 (CCPA 1967).

As the Supreme Court said in *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 USPQ at 696: "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion." As U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals stated *In re Diedrich* 138 USPQ at 130, quoting with approval from the decision of the board: "We do not believe that it was the intention of the statutes to require the Patent Office, the courts, or the public to play the sort of guessing game that might be involved if an applicant could satisfy the requirements of the

statutes by indicating the usefulness of a claimed compound in terms of possible use so general as to be meaningless and then, after his research or that of his competitors has definitely ascertained an actual use for the compound, adducing evidence intended to show that a particular specific use would have been obvious to men skilled in the particular art to which this use relates."

It has been recited in claim 33 that the method of treating neurodegenerative disorders or neuronal damage is intended. There is no such an agent, which can treat neurodegenerative disorders generally. That is because neurodegenerative disorders are extremely varied in origin and nature of effect. The origin and the nature of many neurodegenerative disorders such as Huntington's disease, Pick's disease, Frontotemporal dementia, Cerebro-Oculo-Facio-Skeletal (COFS) syndrome (cranofacial and skeletal abnormalities), Motor neuron disease (muscle weakness), Corticobasal ganglionic degeneration, Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease (fatal disease), Dementia with Lewy bodies, and Progressive supranuclear palsy Dementia are different one from the other. Many neurodegenerative disorders are untreatable to this day.

The symptoms and nature of these diseases are also different one from the other. It can be shown that many of these neurodegenerative disorders have different origin and nature of effect. Some neurodegenerative disorders are hereditary (Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease). Many neurodegenerative disorders vary in how they affect the body and its functions. Diseases such as Cerebral palsy, and Parkinson's disease affect the movement of the patient. Diseases such as Alzheimer's disease affect the memory of the patient.

The scope of uses embraced by the method claims are not remotely enabled based solely on instant compounds ability to inhibit PARP.

Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: the reagents and reaction parameters of the process.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim 24 is again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Webber et al. (US 6,548,494, which is the US equivalent of WO 01/16136 provided by Applicants). The claim reads on the compound of RN 328546-75-4.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webber et al. (US 6,548,494). The reference teaches a generic group of compounds which embraces applicants' claimed compounds (See cols 4-7, compounds of formula (I) and definitions of the variables. The claims differ from the reference by reciting specific species and a more limited genus than the reference. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select any of the species of the genus taught by the reference, including those instantly claimed, because the skilled chemist would have the reasonable expectation that any of the species of the genus would have similar properties and, thus, the same use as taught for the genus as a whole. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such

Art Unit: 1624

compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render *prima facie* obvious a species falling within a genus. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 847 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants argue that in the instant case B is limited to piperidine or piperazine and that the reference does not say that these are preferred substituents.

Applicants are reminded that nonpreferred embodiments constitute prior art. Disclosed examples and preferred embodiments do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. *In re Susi*, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). The reference clearly points to piperazinyl and piperidinyl in the definition of "heterocycloalkyl."

"A known or obvious composition does not become patentable simply because it has been described as somewhat inferior to some other product for the same use." *In re Gurley* , 31 USPQ2d 1130, 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

In the absence of a showing of superior or unexpected results of the claimed compounds over that of the prior art, the claims are *prima facie* obvious.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 1624

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruck Kifle, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0668. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund J. Shah can be reached on 571-272-0674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.

  
Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1624

BK  
April 7, 2004